



University of Tennessee, Knoxville

TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange

Chancellor's Honors Program Projects

Supervised Undergraduate Student Research
and Creative Work

Spring 5-1994

Latin as the Language of Magic Shakespeare's Use of Latinates in King Lear

Reagan M. Avery
University of Tennessee - Knoxville

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_chanhonoproj

Recommended Citation

Avery, Reagan M., "Latin as the Language of Magic Shakespeare's Use of Latinates in King Lear" (1994).
Chancellor's Honors Program Projects.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_chanhonoproj/24

This is brought to you for free and open access by the Supervised Undergraduate Student Research and Creative Work at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Chancellor's Honors Program Projects by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

Latin as the Language of Magic
Shakespeare's Use of Latinates in King Lear

by

Regan Avery

Honors Thesis

April 29, 1994

audience examines Goneril's diction it finds that Regan is right -- "she comes too short." Goneril has not a single word over three syllables in her sets of series which she puts before Lear. While Goneril chops her sentences because of her stylistic choice of a list as her rhetorical device, Regan consciously chooses the opposite for her speech. Her sentences are flowing and overly long. The actress playing Regan will have to take a breath after all of the s-alliteration at the end of line 74, which makes her sound as if she is hissing, if the actress hopes to enunciate the Latinate *felicitate* at the end of 75. Strangely enough, the Latin noun *felicitas*, *felicitatis* (f) from which *felicitate* is derived is not only "happiness" but also "fertility," perhaps indicating that as the younger of the married daughters Regan may be able to produce an heir where her elder sister Goneril, presumably, has failed thus far. Regan chooses a rhetoric more flowing but equally empty as her sister's to profess her love to Lear. Her language shows the audience even at this early point in the play the barrenness of the love of Lear's two elder daughters.

Scene i, lines 76-78:

. . . Then poor Cordelia!
And yet not so, since I am sure my love's
More *ponderous* than my tongue.

Here Cordelia responds to Regan's protestation of love to Lear with an aside in which she tells the audience of her dilemma. She cannot lie like her sisters, yet she loves Lear more than they do. These asides prepare the audience for Cordelia's future coldness, which is merely an effort to avoid becoming a hypocrite. However, her timing and choice of Latinate in this section betrays something about her character. Although she claims her love is more weighty than her tongue in this deed, she nearly verbally negates her own sentiments here by throwing in a Latinate. *Ponderous*, from the Latin adjective *ponderosus*, -a, -um, means "weighty" or "significant." Clearly, Cordelia did not need to use the word here to influence anyone except the audience; she is speaking in an aside. When she makes this statement, the audience feels through her diction that she is just as much a hypocrite as her sisters are. However, when the audience sees how she reacts to Lear's request for her love, it realizes the importance of

the Latinate here. If Cordelia's tongue is less weighty than her heart, and her tongue just said a considerable Latinate like *ponderous*, then her heart must be huge. As Simon Lesser appropriately points out, by this point in the play the readers "know Lear and his daughters, and Kent also, for what they are - and sense their knowledge of, and feelings for, one another" (159). Shakespeare has Cordelia use a Latinate in order to show the audience its own preconceptions by leading the audience from a false assumption of Cordelia's character to a new understanding.

Scene i, lines 113-16:

Here I disclaim all my *paternal* care,
Propinquity and property of blood,
 And as a stranger to my heart and me
 Hold thee, from this, forever.

Lear here formally disowns Cordelia after her refusal to declare her love publicly. Lear speaks in legal Latin, not the Latin of kings with which he begins the scene. Listing the series of things he disowns, he sets forth the action he will take to maintain this estrangement. His use of the word *paternal* instead of "fatherly," which will fit the meter just as well, painfully points out the distance Lear places himself from Cordelia. No longer her father, he assumes the role of legal guardian. Cordelia loves Lear according to her bond; he now repays her with some legal action of his own. As Emily Leider says of the first scene, Lear's words "are polysyllabic nouns of Latin or French rather than native origin, and they announce the world of law and public life" (46). The senselessness of Lear's enraged reaction emerges through the diction in Lear's choice of the word *propinquity* as one of the elements he chooses to disown. Although this word might fit Lear's curse on Kent, seeing as how Kent is banished from the territory and nearness (*propinquus*, -a, -um) comes into play in such a case, it fits Cordelia's curse only in Lear's own mind. He is mentally distancing himself from her love. The audience cringes at the unnaturalness of the new bond Lear forges between father and daughter. The use of Latinates in his anger shows not only Lear's concentration on legal matters at this moment, but also a theme which will appear in Lear's choice of language later in the play.

Lear immediately and clearly demonstrates his inability to give up even linguistically the power which he formally surrenders earlier in the same scene.

Scene i, lines 214-21:

This is most strange,
That she, . . .
The argument of your praise,
. . . should in this trice of time
Commit a thing so monstrous, to *dismantle*
So many folds of favor. Sure, her offense
Must be of such unnatural degree
That *monsters* it. . . .

Here the King of France, about to propose to Cordelia, considers Lear's decision to disown his youngest daughter. His imagery of Lear's favor as a heavy, ornate cloak which Cordelia used to wear around her body works well with the images later in the play when Lear discovers that favor is unreliable and it is best to live as "unaccommodated man" (III.iv.105-6). France's language radiates a nobility, not only in his images, but also in his word choice. His decision to turn the noun "monster" into a verb shows his ability to juggle language successfully to make it work for him instead of working inside the constraints of language as so many characters in the play do. Moreover, he uses Latinates with a skilled, gentle hand, as if he knows the perfect amount of Latin to add. Putting *dismantle* in the middle of the clothing imagery and positioning it at the end of the line give it extra emphasis and draw attention to the care used in choosing it. The Latin noun mantelum, manteli (n) is the basis for the word of choice, meaning both veil and concealment. The veil works as the image of marriage, but it also serves a more important purpose here. The true Cordelia whom Lear cannot see unveils herself to the audience through the next few acts and eventually to Lear himself. France's complete control of the language foreshadows the quality of Edgar's utterances. Perhaps this similar mastery of the language points out something important about how the play would have been acted. Could France and Edgar have been played by the same actor? I cannot find a reason why they could not, and this gives a certain, if revolting, aptness to the

saccharine ending forced upon the text by the late 17th century revisionist, Nahum Tate, who married Cordelia and Edgar in his version.

Scene ii, lines 19-21:

Well, my *legitimate*, if this letter speed
And my *invention* thrive, Edmund the base
Shall top th' *legitimate*.

Edmund in soliloquy divulges his schemes to the audience. His repetition of *legitimate* throughout the soliloquy is humorous, but it shows that he practices his Latinates on the audience before he tries them out on his father. He quickly gets used to feigning nobility and already shows his major downfall in doing so: he overcompensates. Alluding back to the last scene in which Lear gave away his land to his evil daughters and disowned his innocent one, Edmund concentrates on the legal aspects of Gloucester's estate and comes to the conclusion that he must have Edgar's land. As the only way to get it is illegitimately, Edmund, the Machiavellian villain, must tell the audience his nefarious plans.² He reports of a letter and tells the audience that he hopes that his *invention* thrives. *Invention* comes from the Latin, *invenio*, *invenire*, *inveni*, *inventum*, meaning not only "to come upon," but also "to find written," which is exactly what Edmund sets Gloucester up to do in the next section of the scene. In fact, in a mere six lines Gloucester will ask Edmund to see the letter which Edmund puts up so hastily, with Edmund protesting all the while that it is nothing. As the first real introduction of Edmund, if we disregard the first few lines of the play where he says little and acts merely as Gloucester's prop, this scene is crucial in setting up the audience's reaction to Edmund's character and the perception of his handling of Latinates plays a major role in this assessment.

²Sometimes readers sympathize with Edmund, citing the laws working against his inheritance and his reformation before his death as proof of his goodness. I believe that our American society today causes us to pity Edmund in his non-inheritance. In a society of primogeniture, there would be no sympathy for Edmund. His change at the end of the play is too superficial, as well, to serve as proof of a spiritual transformation. He does "some good" (V.iii.247) but not enough to recategorize himself as a non-Machiavellian villain.

Scene ii, lines 92-95:

If your honor judge it meet, I will place you
where you shall hear us confer of this, and by an *auricular* assurance have your *satisfaction*, and that without any further delay than this very evening.

Scheming to get Edgar's inheritance and title, Edmund plans for Gloucester to see a fight which Edmund will arrange between himself and Edgar. His choice of prose makes the scene have a cozy, colloquial flavor to it, but his words scream out his treachery to the audience. The very plotting reveals itself through the original meaning of the undoubtedly relatively common word *satisfaction*; he is going to "make" the scene look "well enough" for his own devious ends (from *satis* plus *facio*, *facere*, *feci*, *factum*). However, Edmund gives himself away unquestionably with his choice of *auricular*. For Edmund, Gloucester cannot simply overhear the conversation; "overhearing" is the action of spies and peasants. *Auricular* is an adaption of the medieval Latin *auricularis*, having to do with the ear. Edmund tries so hard to avoid his unacceptable past that he often trips on his own feet in the process of mending his language by overcompensating. If this overcompensation jumps from the page at the reader or from the actor's mouth to the audience, why does Gloucester not notice it? Shocked, enraged, and overcome by the news of his legitimate son's "betrayal," he totally misses the betrayal which he could easily overhear if he would simply listen to the language of his more calculating son Edmund.

Scene iii, lines 13-14:

Put on what weary *negligence* you please,
You and your fellows. I'd have it come to question.

Goneril advises Oswald to be derelict in his duties when Lear arrives at the castle. Her language, all except one word, typifies Goneril throughout the play. As Hazel Guyol

points out, "The economy of Goneril's speech is such that attempts to paraphrase it frequently result in twice as many words as her spare speech" (318). Her choice of *negligence* here, from neglego, neglegere, neglexi, neglectum, to disregard, must be a sign that she is talking to a servant, since her Latinates occur so rarely. Surely she would not bother to put on a mask for Oswald, who already knows what his mistress is truly like, especially since she does not bother with a mask even for Lear after the first scene. In this way, both she and Edmund show the audience their immorality, Goneril with her lack of language and Edmund with his profusity of it. Ironically, although their ways of getting their ends are so divergent, they both, as villains, most successfully strive for power over all of the others in the play. Goneril covers up her nobility by using plain words; Edmund his baseness by using Latinates.

Act II

Scene i, lines 38-40:

Here stood he in the dark, his sharp sword out,
Mumbling of wicked charms, *conjuring* the moon
To stand *auspicious* mistress.

Edmund describes to Gloucester a scene which never happened in which Edgar supposedly attacked him. Edmund has complete mastery of this dark, evil imagery in which he portrays Edgar. Perhaps his Latinates are more successful here because Edmund basks in his own element, iniquity. The monosyllabic words in the first line help demonstrate John Draper's point that "haste is of the essence in the scene" (391). However, Edmund glides into polysyllabic words in order to pull off the amazing imagery in the lines. The reader can almost see a shadowy figure dedicating his sword to pagan gods with ritualistic whispers. *Conjuring* carries with it a root baggage of oaths and plots, which help fill out Edmund's picture of the deceiving Edgar in Gloucester's mind (coniuro, coniurare, coniuravi, coniuratum). By calling the moon Edgar's "*auspicious* mistress," Edmund achieves many different goals. First and most obviously,

through the language he convicts Edgar of the same sin which landed Gloucester with Edmund, an unnatural adultery of sorts. Secondly and no less importantly, Edmund points to some sort of pagan worship, since *auspicious* comes from auspicium, auspicii (n), a Latin noun which originally referred to taking omens by means of birds. The OED lists as an alternate form of the derivation haruspicium, haruspicii (n), the "liver-looking" noun used of inspecting entrails for divine signs. This is particularly ironic after Edmund's marvelous "Thou, Nature, art my goddess" soliloquy back in I.ii. Truly, Edmund remarkably paints a self-portrait here, a shadowy figure standing in the dark, ready to stab the first person he sees, invoking his heathen protectress to help him carry out his treacherous plans.

Scene ii, lines 106-109

Sir, in good faith, in sincere *verity*,
Under th' allowance of your great *aspect*,
Whose influence, like the wreath of *radiant* fire
On flick'ring Phoebus' front -

Kent tries to mend his speech to fit Cornwall's liking by making it florid and elaborate. Showing off with bizarre allusions and minor Latinates, Kent alters himself from any disguise in which the reader has seen him thus far in the play. Kent progresses from nobleman, in the first scene when he gets himself banished, to pious knight, when he gets Lear to take him on as one of Lear's company. From there he changes to insolent knight, in meeting Oswald, to the form he is in at this point, in which he counterfeits a scorning accommodation to Cornwall's wishes. Kent skillfully manages to mangle this whole passage. He says that he does this "in good faith" and then repeats himself with the comment "in severe *verity*," as if by throwing in a Latinate he has changed the meaning of the phrase or clarified it. His use of the word *aspect* allows him to mock at Cornwall with only the audience understanding his joke, since the audience has just heard Edmund scorning astrology in I.ii. The coupling of "influence" with this *aspect* makes the joke intentional on Shakespeare's part. Then Kent goes on to compare Cornwall with Phoebus Apollo wearing a *radiant* countenance. He uses the present participle form of the

Latinate (radio, radiare, radiavi, radiatum -- radians, radiantis is the present participle) to flatter Cornwall more by describing him as glittering even now when he is mad.

However, the compliment takes a turn when it is not the fire but Phoebus himself who is "flick'ring." If Cornwall were an inconstant character, this misplaced participle might be explained away. However, Cornwall is evil right up until his death; the audience never sees him as an inconstant character. Shakespeare must have put the adjective modifying Apollo instead of his fire for some reason, but I cannot find a reason.

Scene ii, lines 119-25:

When he. . .
 Tripp'd me behind; being down, insulted, rail'd
 And put upon him such a deal of man
 That worthied him, got praises of the King
 For him attempting who was self-subdu'd
 And, in the *fleshment* of this dread exploit,
 Drew on me here again.

In these lines Oswald explains his side of the argument between himself and Kent to Cornwall. Oswald's struggle to appear upper-class becomes painfully apparent in these lines. Much like Edmund, Oswald's attempts are vain in the eyes of the audience members and readers of the text who see through his language disguise. Oswald makes things more obscure than he needs to, describing Kent as having "put upon him such a deal of man" and Kent's attack on Oswald himself as the "attempting [of one] who was self-subdued." There is something wrong with a servant's diction when the reader has to use the footnotes more often for the servant's lines than for the nobleman to whom he relates this information. Oswald so complicates his language that he classes himself right over the language of the highest class; like the "new rich" spending money on the wrong things, Oswald cannot figure out where to invest in fifty-cent words. Finally, Oswald ties his tongue virtually in a knot trying to get out his Latinate-of-the-day, *fleshment*, which does not even trace its roots to Latin. It is French in origin. However, the King of France in this play is admirable. He is not the Frenchman of whom Oswald's incompetence should make the audience think. Instead reminding readers of the ridiculous portrayal of

the French Dauphin in Shakespeare's The Life of King Henry the Fifth, Oswald's complete absurdity in using this word makes the audience laugh at his ineptitude.

Scene iv, lines 55-57:

O, how this mother swells up toward my heart!
Hysterica passio, down, thou climbing sorrow,
 Thy element's below!

Lear cannot believe the cruelty of his daughters as he wonders at Kent in the stocks. His whole speech here is an invective against women. A "mother" swells up towards his heart. His mix of Latin and Greek here shows off his own knowledge still, as it is the language of medical diagnosis. Brownlow points out that in the late 1580s there was an elevation in the number of exorcisms in which women were accused of possession on the basis of whether or not they showed signs of "the mother."³ Lear is not only a king, but also a well-versed ruler. A hysterica passio is literally an affection of the mind caused by suffering from a discomfort in the womb. Lear seeks to separate physically himself from evil by pointing out that corruption emanates from females. Woman is labelled by a phrase which she herself does not understand, not having an education which would have taught her Latin or Greek, and therefore she is powerless to remove the label since she cannot comprehend it. She has been convicted without knowing her crime and the blind aristocracy like Lear are perpetuating this false judgment. Following this train of thought, this judgment in which those women accused cannot defend themselves echoes Lear's deafness to Kent and France's defense of Cordelia in I.i, and foreshadows Lear's judgment passed by Edgar and the Fool on Goneril the joint-stool and Regan in the hovel in III.vi. Thus this medical language points out the superficiality of aristocratic learning and the unfairness of judgment without the possibility of defense.

³Brownlow's recent book, Shakespeare, Harsnett, and the Devils of Denham, is an in-depth critical study of the series of exorcisms in London in the late 1590s and early 1600s and of the texts produced as a result of the incidents. He links these affairs especially to King Lear through Edgar, acting as Mad Tom who sees devils. Although Brownlow gathers immense amounts of critical information, the book reads exceptionally fast, more like a spy novel than a critical work.

Act III

Scene i, lines 19-25:

... There is division,
 Although as yet the face of it is cover'd
 With mutual cunning, 'twixt Albany and Cornwall;
 Who have - as who have not, that their great stars
 Thron'd and set high? - servants, who seem no less,
 Which are to France the spies and *speculations*
Intelligent of our state.

Kent reveals his natural self to the readers, audience, and the Gentleman to whom he talks. This serves both to inform the audience of events and to remind the audience that Kent is a nobleman in disguise. His use of *intelligent* gives an example of a word which in this context had to have its original meaning, although it has it no longer and must be glossed for the modern audience (from intellego, intellegere, intellexi, intellectum). These spies for France are well acquainted with the state; they are not necessarily astute. *Speculations*, which traces its root from speculor, speculari, speculatus sum, a deponent Latin verb meaning "to look around" or "to spy," stands out similarly. The *speculations* in the kingdom are the people who keep their eyes open for a way to help France with news about the feuding Dukes. It is particularly appropriate that Kent says of this conflict that "as yet the face of it is cover'd," since so many of the characters are using Latin to disguise their true nature.

Scene iv, lines 33-36:

... Take *physic*, *pomp*;
 Expose thyself to feel what wretches feel,
 That thou mayst shake the *superflux* to them,
 And show the heavens more just.

In this scene, Lear rages on the heath after the Fool has entered the hovel, who will

appear again moments after this line, once he has been frightened out of the hovel by Edgar disguised as Mad Tom. Lear struggles with his identity through his fusing of language. He still looks for justice in the world, and desperately tries to decide if he is more likely to get it as a king or as an "unaccommodated man" (III.iv.105-6). Lear does not see yet that it does not make a difference. Lear's words are a strange mix of simplicity and complexity. As John Crowe Ransom aptly points out, "There is a slight flurry of Latinity in the *physic*, *pomp*, *expose*. But the key to the passage is *superflux*, a word that nobody had used till now, and, to tell the truth, a word that even this usage did not fix securely in the language" (187). *Physic* and *pomp* are both of Greek origin, but *superflux* appears to have come from the Latin noun *superfluo*, *superfluere*, *superfluxi*, *superfluxum* which is an overflow, especially of water. This is especially appropriate to Lear here standing out on the heath and being soaked the pouring rain. The Latinates are in the scene, however, to contrast with the other non-Latinates Lear uses. Lear repeats a simple word like "feel" and couples it with *physic*, *pomp*, and *superflux* to show linguistically that he is not yet willing to relinquish the position he contractually relinquished in Act one, that of king.

Scene iv, lines 148-151:

Though their *injunction* be to bar my doors
 And let this *tyrannous* night take hold upon you,
 Yet have I ventured to come seek you out,
 And bring you where both fire and food is ready.

Gloucester tries to get raving Lear into a dry, warm spot. Gloucester in all his goodness, refuses to believe that Lear has gone mad, and he continues to address him in formal Latinates. His *injunction* comes from the Latin *iniungo*, *iniungere*, *iniunxi*, *iniunctum*, to charge. Gloucester's choice of the word *injunction* might be what makes the trial idea come into Lear's mind. In addition, Gloucester personifies the night as a *tyrannous* one which might grab Lear if he continues to stand out in the rain. Perhaps Gloucester's choice of *tyrannous* is appropriate considering that the night becomes one filled with tyrants seeking Gloucester in just three scenes. Is the Greek origin of Gloucester's

tyrannous supposed to remind the audience of Oedipus Tyrannos? Certainly, Gloucester's loss of eyes echo an image from that play. All this tyranny is too much for a Gloucester who believes in the order of things and the divine right of kings. When he sees the horrible things happening to Lear which are then echoed in his own life, he begins to question the gods themselves. Although he becomes suicidal, he never gives up his hope that his own language will change the world, and hangs onto his Latinates until the very end, hoping to reestablish the moral order in the world.

Scene vi, lines 75-80:

Then let them *anatomize* Regan; see what breeds
about her heart. Is there any cause in nature that make
these hard hearts? You, sir, I entertain for
one of my hundred; only I do not like the fashion of
your garments. You will say they are Persian; but let
them be chang'd.

Directing the "trial," Lear waits in the hovel right before Gloucester comes for him and the Fool disappears from the play. His diction here shows the struggle of his mind trying to come to terms with all the changes and evil he has come up against in the last few scenes. Gerald Smith makes an interesting point about the phrase "*anatomize* Regan." Understanding the phrase in the context of the trial scene to mean "analyze" not literally "dissect," he points out that "the word 'make' (the folio reading) in 'make these hard hearts?' is in the subjunctive mood. That is, if we could dissect Regan, we might see what breeds about her heart and thus be able to speculate about the natural causes of evil" (119). This present-contrary-to-fact conditional sense of the subjunctive shows the Latin root of Lear's grammar, which comes through as one of the only things he can hang onto when he swings into madness. *Anatomize* is an adaption of the medieval or early modern anatomizo, anatomizare, anatomizavi, anatomizatum. In addition, Lear's comment, after accepting Edgar as a member of Lear's disbanded one hundred, about Edgar's dress shows that Lear indeed reflects on his Latin schooling during the trial scene. Lear echoes

Horace, Odes I. 38, as Ifor Evans points out,⁴ with Lear's "You will say they are Persian; but let them be chang'd." Horace's choice of words is "Persicos odi, puer, apparatus," "I hate Persian pomp, boy." Lear finally realizes, as the narrator of Horace's ode does, that the simple and unassuming is best, but Lear has trouble shaking the Latin which is so ingrained in his personality, as a male, as an aristocrat, and as a king.

Scene vii, lines 9-12:

... Advise the Duke, where you are
going, to a most *festinate* preparation; we are bound
to the like. Our posts shall be swift and *intelligent* be-
twixt us.

Cornwall gives the presently silent Edmund, who accompanies Goneril home, a message for Albany. Like those of Edmund and Oswald, Cornwall's Latinates do not feel as though they quite fit him. However, he does not use Latinates as a disguise, as Edmund does, or as a social aid, as Oswald does. Cornwall is openly evil, as the audience sees in the next scene when he plucks out Gloucester's eyes on stage. He cares nothing for appearances, so his Latinates must be a sign of his noble birth. His use of *intelligent* recalls Kent's use of it earlier in this act. Gloucester is not proposing that the dukes' correspondences will be clever, but, as the word's Latin root *intellego* suggests (see the passage on II.i.19-25), comprehensible, which would be vital in a joint war effort. Although *festinate* falls a bit heavily from Cornwall's tongue, he chooses his Latinate well. *Festinate* avoids the half-done quality of "hurried," and "swift" is already chosen in the next line. Shakespeare obtains a triple word score here with *festinate*, because one cannot argue that he used it because of the meter - after all this is prose; the situation, since Edmund delivering a message is hardly crucial; or the non-availability of any other word. The truth is, *festinate* is simply a wonderful Latinate which Cornwall voices for Shakespeare without it becoming a mockery of the improper use of Latinates.

⁴Ifor Evans, "King Lear," *The Language of Shakespeare's Plays* (London: Methuen, 1952) 149. Evans gives his own citation to Edmund Blunden who discovered these Horatian parallels before Evans.

Act IV

Scene ii, lines 21-24:

... Wear this; spare speech.
Decline your head. This kiss, if it durst speak,
Would stretch thy spirits up into the air.
Conceive, and fare thee well.

Goneril gives Edmund a token as she compares Edmund to Albany. Goneril is amazingly short with Edmund; however, he realizes, as should the audience by now, that this is not rudeness but Goneril's nature. As Hazel Guyol declares, "This is as remarkable a triad of amorous imperatives as can be found in literature" (317). She tells him that she loves him in a series of commands and, amazingly for her spare words, a sexual double-entendre. Guyol goes on to point out rightly that "Goneril's preferred sentence form" is "the imperative" (317).⁵ She is probably the character in the play who gives the most orders, and, ironically, after this scene she finds herself one of the characters least in control. As Oswald correctly confesses to Regan in IV.v, "Your sister is the better soldier" (5). Goneril is blunt, to the point, and efficient in her choice of language, opposing her linguistically to nearly every other character in the play who finds some slight use of Latinates for his or her purpose. Perhaps the best adjective to describe Goneril's speech is laconic; she is aggressively productive in the little language she uses. By refusing to use Latinates, she proves that she can bring about her own power without submitting to the conventions of a male society.⁶

⁵Hazel Guyol, "A Temperance of Language: Goneril's Grammar and Rhetoric," *English Journal* 55 (1966): 317. Guyol's article is just like Goneril's own speech: to the point. She makes a number of astute observations on Goneril's character in the four brief pages of her article, one of the most interesting of which is that "unlike any other character in the play except Edmund, she meets death with a full syntactic sentence" (316).

⁶Of course, one could argue that because Goneril feels she needs to be with Edmund that she submits to the male society. However, Goneril wants to join with Edmund on her own terms. She subverts the male culture by instigating an affair with Edmund under her husband's nose. Goneril makes the initiative. She is sexually independent and Edmund is promising and convenient.

Scene ii, lines 63-67:

Thou changed and self-cover'd thing, for shame,
Be-monster not thy feature. Were 't my fitness
 To let these hands obey my blood,
 They are apt enough to *dislocate* and tear
 Thy flesh and bones.

Here Albany begins to show his true colors, rebuking Goneril for her inhuman behavior. Albany before this point has been not only Latinate-less, but also nearly speechless. Peter Mortenson rightly observes that Albany and Cornwall are virtually the same character in Act I, both husbands of evil sisters in the audience's point of view (Mortenson 218). However, the audience sees quite a lot of Cornwall in the intervening acts -- enough to be happy when a messenger arrives in a few lines with the news that Cornwall has died. Albany does not appear after I.iii until IV.ii, and this makes his unanticipated reaction to the unconscionable intervening events all the more telling of his character. As Leo Kirschbaum explains, "We do not see him again until IV, ii, when most of the evil in the play has already been accomplished. And therein lies the reason for his non-appearance. For when we are allowed to observe him once more, he will be very different" (23). Albany's change is not gradual, but sudden; he goes from a man of little language, like his wife, to one exploding with Latinates. He forewarns Goneril not to *bemonster* her countenance, as if Albany knows she might take off the mask and the audience could see the monster which lies within Goneril's soul. It is interesting that this section is paralleled in the anonymous The True Chronicle History of King Leir and his three daughters, Gonorill, Ragan, and Cordelia, which was written slightly before Shakespeare's version.⁷ However, *bemonster* is not the choice in the anonymous previous play. The passage from it is (from Perillus to Gonorill):

Nay, peace thou monster, shame unto thy sexe,

⁷Bevington explains on p. 1649 that The True Chronicle History of King Leir, though not published until 1605, was probably produced in 1594, according to registers and diaries, and was possibly written as early as 1588. Shakespeare's own King Lear dates from around 1605 and shows considerable differences.

Thou fiend in Likeness of a human creature.

Shakespeare's adaptation of the monster from a noun to a verb is typical of the familiarity he shows with Latinates. The choice of "self-cover'd" not only insults Goneril's sexuality, but also reinforces the theme of masking within which the characters have been working. About this phrase, Mahood is confused, wondering if "we [are] to take the ambiguity of Albany's words to Goneril. . . to mean that Shakespeare knows Goneril to be revealing her real bad self while Albany thinks she is concealing her real good self, or that both meanings are Albany's?" (166), which I think is a question with an indisputable answer, considering the abrupt change in diction which has already been cited about this scene. *Dislocate*, although already in normal use in all likelihood, aptly illustrates Albany's full switch to Latinates. He even uses words of Latin derivation for emphasis in parallel conjunction with similar words.⁸ He will not only "tear" but also *dislocate* Goneril's flesh, bringing the insult onto a higher plane of diction and showing the audience Albany's true nature.

Scene iv, lines 15-18:

. . . All blest secrets,
All you unpublish'd virtues of the earth,
Spring with my tears! Be *aidant* and *remediate*
In the good man's distress!

Regretting her fight with Lear, Cordelia wishes well her father whom she has just seen raving. Her word choice is typical of her character throughout the play. A true nobility lies in Cordelia, not one applied by a title. As such, she speaks Latinates continuously because they are her true nature. She is the only character in the play, as well, who wears no masks. Always who she seems to be, Cordelia's pure lips could utter just as aptly Hamlet's line, "Seems, madam? Nay, it is. I know not 'seems'" (I.ii.76). She starts this speech with two past participles, pointing out even in normal and non-Latinate language

⁸This still keeps him distinct from Oswald, who *uses* *Latinates* in conjunction with non-Latinates for paraphrase, as Shakespeare often does. Albany's words in conjunction have parallel but differing meanings, keeping him from repeating himself.

the Latin form of her language. However, in the next sentence she effervesces with *aidant* and *remediate* in a series. Not only is *aidant* from the old French *aider* adapted from the Latin *adiuvo*, *adiuvare*, *adiuvi*, *adiutum*, meaning "to support" or "to assist," but also Shakespeare puts it in the present participle form of a Latin verb which does not exist. Shakespeare decides to Latinize a French verb. This nice little cheat allows Cordelia to sound distinctly Latinate with a touch of French without compromising the understanding of the audience. *Remediate*, on the other hand, comes from the verb *remedio*, *remediare*, *remediavi*, *remediatum* meaning "to heal" or "to cure." Although the modern "remedy" has kept much the same meaning, our "remedial" has a quite different connotation now associated with it. From the standpoint today, taking the word to mean "remedial" could be detrimental to the modern reader, for Lear does not need rudimentary help but instead aid in coming to terms with his own folly. Cordelia is just the person to offer Lear this help, and her language demonstrates this distinctly.⁹

Scene vi, lines 280-82:

... How stiff is my *vile* sense,
That I stand up, and have *ingenious* feeling
Of my huge sorrows.

Gloucester cries out against his own consciousness after having met distracted Lear on the beach. Gloucester still carries himself linguistically as a nobleman, even after having been blinded and having tried to commit suicide. However, he wishes now that he were also insane after seeing Lear oblivious to his own pain.¹⁰ Gloucester's use of *vile* (from

⁹I think Shakespeare uses two Latinates at this point both because they are not exactly the same in meaning and because Cordelia is an eligible character to say a marvelous mouthful like *'aidant* and *remediate*."

¹⁰A poet who later expresses this sentiment marvelously is the Romantic author Charlotte Smith. Her poem "Sonnet: On Being Cautioned against Walking on a Headland Overlooking the Sea, Because It Was Frequented by a Lunatic" parallels Gloucester's feelings here.

Is there a solitary wretch who hies
To the tall cliff, with starting pace or slow,
And, measuring, views with wild and hollow eyes
Its distance from the waves that chide below;
Who, as the sea-born gale with frequent sighs

vilis, vile, an adjective) is particularly ironic, considering it is this same word which Cornwall used to describe Gloucester's eyes earlier. Then, perhaps, it had more of the meaning "found in quantities," since Cornwall responds to how long it takes him to remove Gloucester's eyes. However, Gloucester here uses *vile* here as "worthless" in valuing his own sorrows against Lear's. His *ingenious* a modern audience would not understand. He does not wonder that he has gifted sensation but instead natural sensation, tracing the word back to the Latin ingenium, ingeni (n). He wishes to be mad like Lear in order to be relieved of his pains, and thus to lose his natural feelings which pain him. Even this late in the play, Gloucester refuses to give up the appearances created by his use of Latinates.

Act V

Scene i, lines 13-14:

I am doubtful that you have been *conjunct*
And bosom'd with her, as far as we call hers.

Regan jealously questions Edmund about his affairs with Goneril. She is very tactful, and her way of saying things without really saying anything proves her a successor to Lear's language in the first scene. She masters the language of a princess. She hints at her thoughts, and Edmund's refusal to expound on these obvious undercurrents anger her into having to say more than she wishes, as Goneril would never do. Regan's *conjunct*,

Chills his cold bed upon the mountain turf,
With hoarse, half-uttered lamentation, lies
Murmuring responses to the dashing surf?
In moody sadness, on the giddy brink,
I see him more with envy than with fear,
He has no *nice felicities* that shrink
From giant horrors; wildly wandering here,
He seems (uncursed with reason) not to know
The depth nor the duration of his woe.

The choice of "nice felicities" hearkens back to Regan's speech at the very beginning of the play, and the measuring of distance reminds the reader of Edgar's description of the waves below the cliff.

into having to say more than she wishes, as Goneril would never do. Regan's *conjunct*, derived from the perfect participle form of the Latin verb coniungo, coniungere, coniunxi, coniunctum, carries meanings along with it of not only a joining together but also a union in marriage as well as an alliance, the last two of which are the chief concerns in Regan's mind the day of the battle. Worried, and rightly so, that Edmund is passionate towards Goneril as well as towards herself, Regan here tries to wield her verbal power through her Latinates. She fails because she does not realize that Edmund, as a liar and Machiavellian villain, understands the uses of language better than she does or ever will.

Scene i, lines 60-64:

... Neither can be enjoy'd,
 If both remain alive. To take the widow
Exasperates, makes mad her sister Goneril;
 And hardly shall I carry out my side,
 Her husband being alive.

Edmund reveals to the audience his plans for the ensuing battle and the two sisters to both of whom he has promised himself. He weighs the consequences of each choice, the first bringing the wrath of Goneril, the second bringing the wrath of Albany. He glosses his own Latinate here, which, although fairly common in Shakespeare, makes Edmund appear as if he needs to remind himself of what he means. *Exasperates* finds its origin in the Latin verb exaspero, exasperare, exasperavi, exasperatum. Edmund is not simply making Goneril mad, as he says, but he is also making her rough, savage, and, most appropriately considering the weather thus far in the play, stormy. Once again, the audience sees an Edmund practicing what he is going to do and say on the audience before he does it when it is going to count. However, all of these scenes with Edmund count towards the audience's evaluation of his character. An Edmund much more sure of himself than when he practiced "legitimate" on the audience back in I.ii, despite the more perilous circumstances in this situation, greets the audience. The fate of a king hangs in the balance, but Edmund flippantly considers the future, still practicing his Latinates although less frequently at this advanced point in the play.

Scene i, lines 43-47:

. . . Wretched though I seem,
I can produce a champion that will prove
What is *avouched* there. If you miscarry,
Your business of the world hath so an end,
And *machination* ceases.

Edgar, disguised, delivers a letter telling of Goneril's faithlessness to Albany before the battle. Although still dressed as a commoner, Edgar's language always points out the nobility under his disguise. Although he states, "Wretched though I seem," he never seems thus to the audience who knows the goodness of Edgar beneath the mask. It is particularly interesting that Shakespeare decides to go from this scene to one with Edmund, and then back to one with Edgar, who is aiding Gloucester. The juxtaposition of the two brothers is intentional. Edgar talks of the *machination* here which Edmund plans for Albany. Such a word falls trippingly from Edgar's tongue, while Edmund would stumble over the language. Edgar's Latinates here are exceptionally appropriate. The first, *avouched*, from the old French *avochier*, adapted from the Latin *advoco*, *advocare*, *advocavi*, *advocatum*, gives Albany the legal evidence to pass judgment on Goneril's adulterous behavior with Edmund. The Latinate used here is legalistic, not necessarily pointing out Edgar's nobility. However, the second, *machination*, from *machinatio*, *machinationis* (f), points out not only the contrivances which Edmund has made to make his charade succeed this far, but also more apparently the evil Edmund plots. It is not linked to Edgar's legal proposition as the first but only to Edgar's own integrity. Edgar, as the good brother, employs Latinates in daily usage comfortably because of his nobility of both lineage and character. As the evil, illegitimate brother, Edmund uses Latinates awkwardly and excessively in his attempt to appear virtuous and aristocratic.

Scene iii, lines 11-15:

. . . So we'll live,

And pray, and sing, and tell old tales, and laugh
 At gilded butterflies, and hear poor rogues
 Talk of court news; and we'll talk with them too -
 Who loses and who wins; who's in, who's out. . . .

Having been captured by Edmund, Lear talks to Cordelia, also caught, about a utopian view of the future. Lear's complete lack of Latinates is of vital importance in this passage. The longest word he says is "butterflies," hardly an unfamiliar word or one Latin in origin. As Emily Leider declares, "in the final scene of the play, linguistic 'lendings' have been cast off; words of one syllable and of native origin dominate Lear's vocabulary" (47). Lear understands the difference between being and seeming, and he learns to pity the court caterpillars seeking gossip and status through their complex language. Lear manages to alter his language so that he is unaccommodated man; he no longer owes anything to anyone. As Robert Berkelman splendidly asserts about Lear's diction in this scene, "When, before or since, were simple, almost crude, words employed with such consummate power?" (237). Lear's diction is now full of action. There are seven future verbs in four lines. This intense, compact style of talking reminds the reader more of Goneril, who demanded things, than of Cordelia, whose "voice was ever soft, / Gentle, and low" (5.3.76-77). Lear forgets one of the most important adjectives to describe Cordelia's speech - Latinate. However, this is probably because Lear's discarded Latin signifies his title and place in the aristocracy, whereas Cordelia's represents her nobility, in the sense of integrity and virtue. Therefore, Cordelia never needs to mend her speech, but Lear does need to in order to progress through the play and learn at the end. He concedes that his language alone will not accommodate him.

Scene iii, lines 137-41:

False to thy gods, thy brother, and thy father,
Conspirant 'gainst this *high-illustrious* prince,
 And, from th' extremest upward of thy head
 To the descent and dust below thy foot
 A most *toad-spotted* traitor.

Edgar takes up Albany's challenge against Edmund. Particularly simple for the most part, Edgar's language includes apostrophes which make his speech sound colloquial. Especially endearing is Edgar's choice of *toad-spotted* as his epithet for his brother, for Edmund's language has been giving away his venomous interior all along. However, *conspirant* stands out, not only as a Latinate but also as a Latin present participial form used as a noun (conspiro, conspirare, conspiravi, conspiratum -- conspirans, conspirantis is the present participial). If Shakespeare had wanted Edgar to say "conspirer," Edgar would have said it. There is no metrical problem with the switch. However, even in this humble disguise, Edgar cannot hide his nobility. *Conspirant* brings up two aspects of Edmund's personality. In the positive sense of the word, it points out the agreements upon which he has entered, albeit evil, legalistic concordances, "breathing along with" someone else in each; in the negative sense of the Latin root, it labels him as the plotter of these evils. Describing Albany as first a prince, something which no one has called him so far, and furthermore one who is *high-illustrious* delineates aspects of Albany's character which Edgar and the audience have known since Albany came back in IV.ii. Not only does this word mark him as "distinguished," but also it shows his "plain" and "evident" nature. Edgar scorns Edmund's sinister nature and allows Albany's goodness to shine through in this passage without giving himself away to anyone except the audience listening to his words.

Allusions to Latin, however, occur not only in the Latinity of the language, but also in the references Shakespeare makes both to mythological events or characters and to Roman authors. It is hard to achieve a reader-response reading of Shakespeare because the perception of Shakespeare's intended audience is always changing. However, it would be plausible to state that it was more likely that the audience would recognize mythological and authorial allusions in the play more quickly than the Latinites themselves. The Latinites are made more acceptable by the ambience created by these more familiar allusions.

Mythology

About IV.vi.118-131 and IV.vii.46-49,¹¹ as Michael Andrews points out, Lear associates himself with the mythical Ixion, the man strapped to a wheel in the underworld. Having disguised himself as a cloud, he made love to Hera. The children of this unnatural coupling were the centaurs, and Andrews brings up the element that "just as Ixion's bi-natured progeny were both symbol and consequence of their father's sin, [Goneril's and Regan's] monstrous nature symbolizes Lear's own moral deformity" (23). Robert Root takes this allusion a step further, seeing it as an example of human nature, a creature which is half-man and half-animal, much as Lear becomes upon the heath.¹²

Harry Rusche investigates the research done on the astrology so crucial to the dialogues between Gloucester and Edmund at the beginning of the play. He finds that a previous astrological researcher "suggests in his analysis of Edmund's remarks that any union of Mars and Venus produces a despicable and faithless villain" (163) but fails to take this one step further and examine this astrological union mythologically. Of course,

¹¹The exact lines from the Bevington text are (both spoken by Lear):

Behold yond simp'ring dame,
Whose face between her forks presages snow,
That minces virtue, and does shake the head
To hear of pleasure's name;
The fitchew, nor the soiled horse, goes to 't
With a more riotous appetite.
Down from the waist they are Centaurs,
Though women all above.
But to the girdle do the gods inherit,
Beneath is all the fiends'.
There's hell, there's darkness, there is the sulphurous pit,
Burning, scalding, stench, consumption. Fie, Fie, Fie!
Pah, pah! Give me an ounce of civet, good apothecary,
sweeten my imagination. There's money for thee. (IV.vi.118-131)

You do me wrong to take me out o' th' grave.
Thou art a soul in bliss; but I am bound
Upon a wheel of fire, that mine own tears
Do scald like molten lead. (IV.vii.46-49)

¹²Root talks about this in his section on *King Lear* on page 129 of his study, which is divided into two sections, of mythology in Shakespeare's works. The first half allows the reader to look up classical allusions under the gods and heroes referred to; the second half divides these allusions by the work of Shakespeare in which they occur. This form makes the book twice as useful. Readers not familiar with one of the two aspects can work with the one with which they are most comfortable.

Mars and Venus are the god and goddess whom Vulcan found together and caught with his nets. Their love, like the description given by Gloucester of the relationship that existed between him and Edmund's mother, was one at which there was "good sport at [the] making" (I.i.23). Although Venus did not conceive from this union, Edmund's mother did, and her progeny was a sign of the strangeness of the act. Edmund truly is the son of Mars and Venus, warlike and scheming but at the same time strangely seductive.

Latin Authors

J. A. K. Thomson's well-known investigation of Shakespeare's use of the classics qualifies what it takes to classify a selection in Shakespeare as an allusion to a Latin author.

An apparent parallel in Shakespeare to some passage in an ancient author must, if we are to be convinced of borrowing, fulfil two conditions. First, the thought must have something uncommon in it; that is to say, it must be a thought which was not likely to occur to Shakespeare independently. Second, the wording of the thought must exhibit a turn which indicates that he had the original in mind, since otherwise he might be using a translation, which we know to have been a common practice with him (31).

These allusions to authors also help set the tone to allow ready acceptance by the audience of Shakespeare's use of Latin.

Inside the play there are parallels to Horatian themes. T. W. Baldwin notes these resemblances to Horace throughout Shakespeare's work, and even suggests a text with which Shakespeare may have been familiar.

I believe that a sufficient number of these parallels are of such a nature as to make it clear that Shakspeare had read the Odes of Horace in the detailed fashion which was demanded in grammar school, and it seems reasonably clear that he had read them in some edition of Lambinus, not earlier than that of 1567 (512).

Lambinus has an annotated Latin edition. Since he points out a source that is not an English translation, Baldwin avoids undermining his argument that Shakespeare had an exceptional familiarity with Latin.

Ifor Evans picks up on this same Horatian tendency of Shakespeare's, especially in the character of Lear himself. Evans points to Horace's Epistles as the source. He sees Lear as continuously seeing life through the philosophy expressed in Horace's first Epistle of the second book, specifically through the following section:

Ille per extantum funem mihi posse videtur
Ire poeta, meum qui pectus inaniter angit,
Irritat, mulcet, falsis terroribus implet,
Ut magus, et modo me Thesbis, modo ponit Athenis (414).
 That poet seems to me to be able to go though
 A tight rope, who presses on my chest vainly,
 He excites, he milks, he fills with false terrors,
 And like a magician, now places me in Thebes
 and now in Athens.

This section from II.i.210-13 of Horace's epistles demonstrates Lear's overwhelming preoccupation with appearances (Evans 149).

The love-test of I.i is reminiscent of the first line of Julius Caesar's De Bello Gallico. Lear's division of the kingdom into three parts provides the fairy-tale perspective of the opening scene. However, it does ring of Caesar's "Gallia est omnis divisa in partes tres," "all Gaul is divided into three parts." As a ruler, Lear's comparison to Caesar ends there. Oddly enough, Lear was part of Geoffrey of Monmouth's line of kings in his Historia Regum Britanniae, in which he uses Lear as one of the important links of descent between Aeneas and the historical kings of England (Bevington 1649). Lear's demeanor assumes a classical tendency for many readers.

On the other hand, Robert Fleissner sees in the very first scene evidences of Corderius, both his Dialogues and his Colloquies. As for the whole bantering throughout the play about what will come of nothing, Fleissner looks back to Colloquy number 68, adding that the fact "that the Lear-Cordelia interchange in the love-test should have a Latin derivation is hardly surprising in that the King's response (with the can/will variant) has commonly been related to the maxim ex nihilo nihil fit" (144). As the concept of nothing is one of the most crucial aspects

of the play, the Latin source for the aphorism stresses the inability to separate the Latin from King Lear.

Latin is a crucial element for the characters in King Lear. By merely listening to the words and not what they mean, the audience member can tell the intended nature of the character. The most impressive linguistic transformation occurs in the character of Lear himself. Beginning the play in a legalistic manner, he tries to sustain through Latin the kingdom which he has given away. As the play progresses his struggles become more violent and his swings between exceptional Latinates and Anglo-Saxon become noticeably frantic. When his madness sets in his language becomes a jumbled mix of confusion with utter clarity. In V.iii. Lear realizes the folly of his attempt to accommodate himself through language and abandons all Latinates in order to speak with his daughter Cordelia in her own pure language. Through diction Shakespeare paints a picture of Lear's inner ragings for the audience, allowing the linguistic transformation to occur unconsciously in the mind of the audience member not intently listening to the Latinates of the play.

Works Cited

- Andrews, Michael. "Lear's Wheel of Fire and Centaur Daughters." Renaissance Papers (1966): 21-24.
- Arthos, John. "Shakespeare and the Ancient World." Michigan Quarterly Review. Ed. Radcliffe Squires. Vol. 10. Ann Arbor: Michigan UP, 1971. 149-63.
- Baldwin, Thomas Whitfield. William Shakspeare's Petty School. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1943.
- Baldwin, Thomas Whitfield. William Shakspeare's Small Latin and Lesse Greeke. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1944. Vol. 2.
- Berkelman, Robert. "The Quintessence of Shakespeare." South Atlantic Quarterly 50 (1951): 233-238.
- Bevington, David. The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Glenview: Scott, 1980.
- Bolgar, R. R. The Classical Heritage and Its Beneficiaries. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1963.
- Brownlow, F. W. Shakespeare, Harsnett, and the Devils of Denham. Newark: U of Delaware P, 1993.
- Cassell's Latin Dictionary. New York: Funk, 1958.
- Champion, Larry S. King Lear: An Annotated Bibliography. 2 vols. New York: Garland, 1980.
- Draper, John W. "Patterns of Humor and Tempo in King Lear." Bulletin of the History of Medicine 21 (1947): 390-401.
- Dry, Helen. "Words in King Lear." Thoth 13.2 (1973): 11-17.
- Dutton, Richard. William Shakespeare: A Literary Life. London: Macmillan, 1989.
- Erlich, Bruce. "Structure, Inversion, and Game in Shakespeare's Classical World." Shakespeare Survey. Ed. Kenneth Muir. Vol. 31. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1978. 53-64.
- Evans, Ifor. "King Lear." The Language of Shakespeare's Plays. London: Methuen, 1952. 146-59.
- Fleissner, Robert F. "King Lear's Love Test: A Latin Derivation." Notes and Queries 15 (1968): 143-44.

- Garner, Bryan A. "Latinate Past Participles as Metrical and Tonal Variants in Shakespeare." Language and Style. Ed. Beatrice Bergen. Vol. 18(3). Flushing: Queens College P, Summer 1985. 242-47.
- Garner, Bryan A. "Shakespeare's Latinate Neologisms." Shakespeare Studies. Ed. J. Leeds Barroll. Vol. 15. New York: Franklin, 1982. 149-70.
- Guyol, Hazel Sample. "A Temperance of Language: Goneril's Grammar and Rhetoric." English Journal 55 (1966): 316-19.
- Harbage, Alfred. Shakespeare Without Words and Other Essays. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1972.
- Hightet, Gilbert. The Classical Tradition: Greek and Roman Influences on Western Tradition. New York: Galaxy, 1957.
- Horace. The Odes of Horace in English Verse. Ed. H. E. Butler. New York: Houghton, 1932.
- Horace. Satires, Epistles, Ars Poetica. H. Rushton Faircloth, trans. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1942.
- Keefer, Michael H. "Accommodation and Synecdoche: Calvin's God in King Lear." Shakespeare Studies. Ed. J. Leeds Barroll. Vol. 20. New York: Franklin, 1988. 147-68.
- Kirschbaum, Leo. "Albany." Shakespeare Survey 13 (1960): 20-29.
- Leider, Emily W. "Plainness of Style in King Lear." Shakespeare Quarterly 21 (1970): 45-53.
- Lesser, Simon. "Act One, Scene One, of Lear." College English. 32 (1970-1971): 155-71.
- MacIntyre, Jean. "Shakespeare's King Lear, III,vi,8." Explicator 21 (1962-1963): Item 24.
- Mahood, M. M. Shakespeare's Wordplay. London: Methuen, 1957.
- Martindale, Charles and Michelle. Shakespeare and the Uses of Antiquity. New York: Routledge, 1990.
- Mortenson, Peter. "The Role of Albany." Shakespeare Quarterly 16 (1965): 217-25.
- Nameri, Dorothy E. Three Versions of the Story of King Lear. Vol. 1. Elizabethan and

- Renaissance Studies 50. Salzburg: U Salzburg, 1976.
- New College Latin and English Dictionary. New York: Bantam, 1971.
- Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1989.
- Oxford Latin Dictionary. Oxford: Clarendon P, 1968.
- Pearce, T. M. "Shakespeare's Classical Charactonyms." Shakespeare Newsletter. Ed. Louis Marder. Vol. 13. Kent: Kent State UP, 1963. 50.
- Ransom, John Crowe. "On Shakespeare's Language." Sewanee Review 55 (1947): 181-98.
- Root, Robert Kilburn. Classical Mythology in Shakespeare. New York: Gordian P, 1965.
- Rusche, Harry. "Edmund's Conception and Nativity in King Lear." Shakespeare Quarterly 20 (1969): 161-64.
- Shakespeare, William. "King Lear." The Complete Works of Shakespeare. Ed. David Bevington. Glenview: Scott, 1980. 1168-1215.
- Smith, Charlotte. "Sonnet: On Being Cautioned against Walking on a Headland Overlooking the Sea, Because It Was Frequented by a Lunatic." Women Romantic Poets. Ed. Jennifer Breen. London: Dent, 1992. 42.
- Smith, Gerald. "Anatomize Regan." American Notes and Queries 2 (April 1964): 119-20.
- Smith, Nellie Angel. The Latin Elements in Shakespeare and the Bible. Vol. 2. George Peabody College for Teachers Contributions to Education 32. Nashville: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1929.
- Spencer, T. J. B. "Shakespeare and the Elizabethan Romans." Shakespeare Survey. Ed. Allardyce Nicoll. Vol. 10. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1969. 27-38.
- Thomson, J. A. K. Shakespeare and the Classics. New York: Barnes, 1952.
- Updike, John. "Wife-Wooing." The Experience of the American Woman. Ed. Barbara Solomon. New York: Penguin, 1978. 348-352.
- Velz, John W. "The Ancient World in Shakespeare: Authenticity or Anachronism? A Retrospect." Shakespeare Survey. Ed. Kenneth Muir. Vol. 31. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1978. 1-12.

Zitner, Sheldon P. "King Lear and Its Language." Some Facets of "King Lear:" Essays in Prismatic Criticism. Eds. Rosalie L. Colie and F. T. Flahiff. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 1974. 3-22.